

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/804,464	03/13/2001	Thomas M. Kundig	05184.00002	8772	
22907	7590 10/10/2003		EXAM	INER	
BANNER & WITCOFF 1001 G STREET N W SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20001			HUYNH, PI	HUYNH, PHUONG N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1644		
		DATE MAILED: 10/10/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/804,464	KUNDIG ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Phuong Huynh	1644			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR RE	<u>:PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]				
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amounted the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) $oxed{oxed}$ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment( explanation of how the new or amended claims wo					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .					
Claim(s) objected to: <i>None</i> .					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,14,19-26,45 and 46</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.					
. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
0. Other:					
		i			

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 1 "no more than three injections" raises the issue of 112 second paragraph for depedent claims 23, 25 and 26 that require further consideration because base claim 1 fails to provide antecedent basis for "1 to 5 doses" in dependent claim 23, "fewer than about 10 doses" in claim 25 and "1 to about 5 doses" in claim 26. Further, the declaration by Thomas Kundig under 37 CFR 1.132 is unsigned. All rejections remain.

GHRÍSTINA CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600